



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,479	10/20/2005	Bernhard Frei	P05,0201	3582
26574	7590	10/08/2008		
SCHIEF HARDIN, LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 6600 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473			EXAMINER WILLS, LAWRENCE E	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/08/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/537,479

Applicant(s)

FREI, BERNHARD

Examiner

LAWRENCE E. WILLS

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/3/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 26 is directed to a software product. A software product is a computer program and is considered to be nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 14, 19, 24, 25, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huber et al. (US Patent No. 6,449,385).

Regarding claims 14, 25, 26, 27, and 28, Huber'385 teaches a device for real-time monitoring of a print image (Fig. 1), comprising: a printing device (printing press, column 4, line 28); an optical scanning device which scans the printed material (image detecting device B, column 4, lines 26); an evaluation device that is connected with the optical scanning device (Fig. 1, image data from B being sent to counter and comparison circuit, column 4, lines 32-34), the evaluation device comprising a computer (computer, column 6, lines 10-11) with a storage (column 5, lines 45) and a central processor (processor 17 column 6, lines 10-11); a program

stored in the storage of the evaluation device (software, column 6, line 21); and the program monitoring the print image by digitizing a real image in individual pixels (image detecting device B, column 4, lines 26), segmenting a reference image into a plurality of segments (subdivided into inspection areas 13, column 4, line 56) such that respective pixels in the respective segments exhibit approximately a same color property as the respective segments (zonal grouping color zones, column 4, line 61), a reference value describing said color property being associated with the pixels arranged in the respective segments (each inspection area has a height in y direction being equal to a respective ink zone width of the color zone of an inking unit of the printing press, column 3, line 42-45), and comparing color properties of the pixels of the real image with the corresponding reference values of the reference image (nominal/actual data comparison, column 4, line 35), and given a deviation above the predetermined threshold value (defect data F exceed a threshold, column 4, line 40), marking a corresponding pixel as an error in a result image (column 5, line 23), boundary regions of the segments not being considered in the comparison (column 5, lines 8-14).

Regarding claim 19, Huber'385 teaches wherein the result image is compressed for transfer to a monitoring station (column 5, lines 43-45).

Regarding claim 24, Huber'385 teaches the monitoring of the print image is a real-time monitoring (column 29-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15, 18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huber et al. (US Patent No. 6,449,385) as applied to claim 14 above, and in further view of Darel et. al (US Patent No. 6,024,018).

Regarding claim 15, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein the color properties associated with the segments are grey levels or color values, or grey values and color values.

Darel'018 teaches wherein the color properties associated with the segments (Region Of Interest, Fig. 7) are grey levels or color values, or grey values and color values (ROI, column 9, line 66-column 10, line 10).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include the region of interest as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Regarding claim 17, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein the boundary regions exhibit a width of 1 to 10 pixels.

Darel'018 teaches wherein the boundary regions exhibit a width of 1 to 10 pixels (ROI weights, column 10, line 45).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include the region of interest as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Regarding claim 18, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein the result image is prepared in that individual pixels or a few pixels that are contiguous and marked as errors are reset in the result image (column 15, lines 25-30), such that these pixels are not marked as errors in the prepared result image (color corrections applied, column 15 lines 25-30).

Darel'018 teaches wherein the result image is prepared in that individual pixels or a few pixels that are contiguous and marked as errors are reset in the result image (column 15, lines 25-30), such that these pixels are not marked as errors in the prepared result image (color corrections applied, column 15 lines 25-30).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include improving the quality of image with errors as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Regarding claim 20, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein for the segmentation of the reference image providing a digital reference image with a plurality of pixels; determining contiguous regions with approximately the same color property, such a region respectively forming the segment; and associating the reference value with the pixels of the segment, the reference value being a measurement for the color property of the respective segment

Darel'018 teaches wherein for the segmentation of the reference image providing a digital reference image with a plurality of pixels (column 9, lines 35-40); determining contiguous regions with approximately the same color property, such a region respectively forming the segment (clustering algorithm, column 9, line 56); and associating the reference value with the pixels of the segment, the reference value being a measurement for the color property of the respective segment (Step 194, Fig. 9, column 9 line 65-column 10, line 10).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include segmentation and clustering as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Regarding claim 21, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein a non-reference value is associated with the pixels at the boundary region of the segments, which means that said pixels are not to be compared with the pixels of the real image.

Darel'018 teaches wherein a non-reference value is associated with the pixels at the boundary region of the segments, which means that said pixels are not to be compared with the pixels of the real image (ROI weights, column 10, line 45).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include control the tolerance as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Regarding claim 22, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein in the determination of contiguous regions with the same color property, all pixels are selected for such a region whose color property values lie within a certain range around the value of said color property.

Darel'018 teaches wherein in the determination of contiguous regions with the same color property, all pixels are selected for such a region whose color property values lie within a certain range around the value of said color property (column 10, lines 1-10).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include a standard clustering technique as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Regarding claim 23, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein segments that are smaller than a predetermined size and that exhibit an adjacent segment whose color property is less removed than a predetermined color interval from the color property of said segment is joined with the adjacent segment, a color property averaged from the color properties of both segments being used as a color property of the joined segment.

Darel'018 teaches wherein segments that are smaller than a predetermined size and that exhibit an adjacent segment whose color property is less removed than a predetermined color interval from the color property of said segment is joined with the adjacent segment, a color property averaged from the color properties of both segments being used as a color property of the joined segment (average for each ROI, column 11 lines 5-35).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Darel'018 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include an averaging color properties as taught by Darel'018 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huber et al. (US Patent No. 6,449,385) as applied to claim 14 above, and in further view of Michael et al. (US Publication No. 2001/0012395).

Regarding claim 16, Huber'385 fails to teach wherein the pixels of the real image are mapped to corresponding pixels of the reference image via an affine mapping before the comparison.

Michael'395 teaches wherein the pixels of the real image are mapped to corresponding pixels of the reference image via an affine mapping before the comparison (paragraph 0014).

Having a system of Huber'385 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Michael'395 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image inspection system of Huber'385 reference to include affine mapping as taught by Michael'395 reference because the result would have yielded predictable results and would improve the image inspection system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAWRENCE E. WILLS whose telephone number is (571)270-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on 571-272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

LEW
October 1, 2008